

A

a 582.

DISCOURSE

AGAINST

Transubstantiation.

702. c 11
17

By WILLIAM SALMON Pro-
fessor of Physick, living at the Blew-
balony by the Dutch-side near Holbourn-
Bridge, London.



L O N D O N,

Printed for Richard Baldwin, 1690.

A
DISCOURSE

AGAINST

Tranquil Humiliation

By WILLIAM SALMON, Pro-
fessor of Divinity, living at the time
of the Dissolution of the Monastery
of St. Dunstons, London.

LONDON

Printed for J. B. R. 1700.

A DISCOURSE

AGAINST

Transubstantiation, &c.

Pro. **M**Y first Argument is drawn from the veracity and faithfulness of God, from thence affirming, That the Bread and Wine after the words of Consecration are no God, but an Idol. In order to the proving of this, you must grant me two Propositions.

Papist. Let's hear your Propositions.

Pro. I affirm, that God is true, just, faithful, keeps promise, and cannot lye or contradict himself: this is the first proposition.

Papist. I grant it; it is impiety to say the contrary.

Pro. The second Proposition is, That the Bread and Wine are no God before the words of Consecration, viz. That it is not that very Body and Blood of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, which was born of the Virgin Mary, and suffered without the Gates of Jerusalem.

Papist. You say right. For if it was that before the words of Consecration, there would be no need for the Priest to consecrate it, and make it that. What I pray do you infer from thence?

Pro. I infer this, that the Bread and Wine before
A Consecration,

Consecration, are no God, nor any thing like a God, but another thing than God.

Papist. I grant it, it is another thing and not God.

Prot. Now you have destroyed your own Tenet, for by the granting these two Propositions, you have overturned the Omnipotency of your Idol or breaden God.

Papist. Which way I pray you, with all your Wit?

Prot. You have granted by the second Proposition, that the Bread and Wine were no God, before the words of Consecration, but another thing than God. And by the first Proposition, That God is true, just, faithful, keeps promise, and cannot lye or contradict himself, now the Lord himself has said, *Isa. 42. 8. I am the Lord, that is my name, I will not give my glory to another, nor my praise to Graven Images.* You have granted the Bread and Wine to be another thing than God before the Words of Consecration, and he has promised, that he will not give his Glory to another, or any thing besides himself, which he must do in the highest and largest sense, if he makes any created Being, either himself, or, equal to himself. Whereby, against the contents of the first Proposition you charge God unjustly, with falshood, lying, injustice, breach of promise, and the greatest contradiction: which is the highest of Indignities you can put upon the great Creator and Fabricator of all things; and the greatest impiety which can be acted on your part.

Papist. Enough of your first Argument, what is the second?

Prot. It arises from the Grammatical Construction of the Words *hoc est corpus meum.* This is my body: it is this, That a Noun Substantive of the masculine or feminine Gender, if not exprest but understood (except only the word Thing) is never denoted by a neuter Article or Adjective. In order to the proving of this, you must grant me these two Propositions.

Papist.

Papist. What are they, in the Name of the Host?

Prot. My first Proposition is this. That all Adjectives must agree with their Substantives in Number, Case and Gender, whether expressed or understood, except in the word Thing.

Papist. That is true, for it is a common and plain Grammatical Rule.

Prot. My second Proposition is this, That where-ever a Neuter Article or Adjective is found, without it's Substantive exprest, except it be put substantively, it is always to be construed, with a Neuter Substantive understood, or the word *Thing*, otherwise it will be pure Non-sense.

Papist. This is true Grammar, or else I understand nothing of *Greek* or *Latine*; but what is this to Divinity?

Prot. You know the words which you use in Consecration are in *Greek* τὸ ὅτι τὸ σῶμα μου. in *Latin*, *hoc est corpus meum*: in *English*, *This is my Body*. Where if ἄρτος, *Panis*, *Bread*, be understood to be construed with [τὸ, *hoc*] it is pure Nonsense by the second Proposition, like τὸ ἄρτος, *hoc panis*, a Masculine and a Neuter together: and against a common and plain Grammar rule by the first Proposition, which to maintain shews a deficiency in Scholarship, and first Rudiments of Learning.

Papist. This is a Quibble, but proceed to your third Argument.

Prot. My third Argument is taken from the nature and definition of a Sacrament, which we will fetch from your own Popish Authors, not from Protestants. And because we will not trouble the unlearned with *Bellarmine*, and other abstruse Doctors of the *Romish Church*, not intelligible with the Vulgar, we will take our Text no higher than either the *Dewey Catechism*; Or, that late Abstract of it, Printed by *Henry Hills*, the Kings Printer.

Let

Papist. Let us hear this your mighty Argument.

Prot. The first proposition is this. That the sign of a thing and the thing it self, are two different things: Or, that the sign of a thing and the thing signified, are no more the same, than the *Type*, and the *Antitype*: Or the Sign of the *Kings-head* in *Holborn*, and the *Kings Head* it self; which in the great solemnity of the Coronation at *Westminster*, was adorned with the Royal Diadem.

Papist. You are very much in the right, or else I am in the wrong.

Prot. I grant both, and therefore we will proceed.

Papist. What is the second Proposition?

Prot. It is this. *That a Sacrament in general is a visible sign of an invisible Grace instituted by Christ for our Sanctification.* This is the definition of a Sacrament, as it is taken word for word out of the *Doway* Catechism, and other of your own approved Authors.

Papist. It is so. For you have taken it word for word out of *Henry Hills* his Abstract of the said *Doway* Catechism, very lately Printed, and given about the Streets of the City; and so I shall not deny it, for I verily believe you have it in your Pocket to prove it, and to disprove me, if I should gain say it: But had it not been for that silly little Book, I should have put you to the proof of it.

Prot. So you may yet if you please: but then you should see, that I would as easily prove this definition of a Sacrament out of *Bellarmin*, and other Popish Authors, as now I do it out of the *Doway* Catechism.

Pap. Hereticks can turn the best things to an ill use; and like Spiders draw damnable Poysons out of Antidotes: but let's hear how you will lay your Propositions together.

Prot. By the second Proposition you grant me, That a Sacrament is no more than a Visible sign: and by the first Proposition, you grant that the sign and the thing signified cannot be one and the same thing, but two different things. From whence I infer, That if the Sacrament be but a sign of Christ's Body offered up, and broken for us; then it cannot be the thing, viz. Christ's body it self; but differs as much from the Body of Christ, as the Type does from the Antitype; Or, a shadow from the Substance. And from hence it appears, that whilst you worship that for a God which is no God, you worship an Idol, and by that Act, become Idolaters.

Papist. This Argument seems to be close and cunningly laid, and may do us much harm in time if not overthrown. But proceed to another Argument.

Prot. My fourth and last Argument which I will use in this place, is taken from the nature of a Body compared with a Place with relation to Time.

Papist. Sure this must be some wonderful discourse.

Prot. I'll manage it as wonderfully, if I can. My first Proposition is this. One and the same body, in one and the same place, at one and the same time, cannot be two distinct bodies of equal magnitude and shape and both singly and together, be one and the same Body in the same place, and the same time.

Papist. This is true. One and the same Sow, in one and the same Place, at one and the same Time, cannot be two distinct Sows of equal magnitude and shape, and both singly and together be just equal to, and be the same Sow, in the same space of Place, at the very same time. I know nobody can contend for a thing so unreasonable, which our Senses alone are able to convince us of as manifestly false.

Prot. I am glad you will grant something. My second Proposition is this. That the Body of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, at his last Supper, when he held the

[30]
the Bread in his Hand, afterward the Words of Consecration, did not take up the same space of Place, at the same time, which the Bread did after the Consecration, which he held in his Hand, and between his Fingers.

Papist. What Inference do you draw from hence ?

Prot. Since by the second Proposition, the real and true body of our Lord, which was born of the Virgin Mary, did not subsist in the same space of Place, and in the same time, which the bread (after the words of Consecration) did : And since by the first proposition, the body which does not take up the same space of Place at the same time, cannot be the same body : it follows, that the bread (after the words of Consecration) was no more that very same body that was born of the Virgin Mary, than it was before the said words of Consecration were spoken : from whence I conclude that worshipping it, viz. the Bread or Host, as you call it, you worship a damnable Idol, and no God.

Papist. But we expound the Eucharist or Sacrament otherwise.

Prot. No you do not. For in *Henry Hills* his Abstract of the *Doway Catechism*, Pag. 48. you say, *I in the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, true God, and true Man, whole Christ, under the likeness and outward shape of Bread, the true and real presence of his divine and human nature, and not significatively only, as Heretics would have it.* Which whether any thing can be more blasphemous I leave to the Rational and Prudent Man to judge. From this Argument, Christ must have had two Bodies at one and the same time, each of which was whole Christ, of the same magnitude, and yet both but one and the same Body : which two Bodies were also in two different places, which two places were but one and the same space of Place : and at several and different times, which were also but one and the same time. This is pure and exalted Non-sense in the Abstract.

William Salmon



cra-
the
ion,
.
e ?
true
ary,
the
Con-
tha
Place
fol-
tion)
n of
ds of
clude
s you
od.
amen

s Ab
ay, A
ed true
hape e
woul
e bla
Man t
ve ha
whi
and y
Bod
es we
ral a
ne fan
the Ab
Salmon